

7. Consultation and Coordination

7.1 Public Participation and Notification

The public participation and notification program for the EIR/EIS focused on two areas of CEQA and NEPA: (1) Public Scoping and (2) Draft EIR/EIS public review. This section describes the specific public outreach methods that were used for this EIR/EIS in order to comply with these requirements.

7.1.1 Scoping Process

Scoping Requirements

Scoping, or the process of involving the public and agencies in determining the scope and content of an EIR or EIS, is encouraged and utilized under both CEQA and NEPA. Scoping is an effective way to solicit and address the environmental concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. In addition to the purpose of informing the public about the proposed Project, the scoping process is also meant to achieve the following: (1) identify potentially significant environmental impacts for consideration in the EIR/EIS; (2) identify possible mitigation measures for consideration in the EIR/EIS; (3) identify alternatives to the proposed Project for evaluation in the EIR/EIS; and (4) compile a notification list of public agencies and individuals interested in future Project meetings and notices. Scoping can take many different forms, including public and agency consultation, scoping meetings and notices such as the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent.

Proposed Project EIR/EIS - Scoping

The scoping process for the TRTP EIR/EIS consisted of four main elements, which are listed below and described in the following sections.

- 1) Publish a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR and a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS, which marked the beginning of the 30-day scoping period, announced public scoping meetings, and solicited comments from affected public agencies and members of the public.
- 2) Conduct public scoping meetings and consultation meetings with agencies.
- 3) Document in a written report the public and agency comments received on the proposed Project.
- 4) Establish an Internet web site, electronic mail address, a telephone hotline, and local EIR/EIS Information Repositories to make Project-related documents and information accessible.

As described in CEQA and NEPA, the scoping process was intended and developed to inform the public and allow interested parties to express their concerns regarding the proposed Project, thereby ensuring that relevant opinions and comments were considered in the environmental analysis for the EIR/EIS. Members of the public, relevant federal, State, regional and local agencies, interests groups, community organizations, and other interested parties were given the opportunity to participate in the scoping process through attendance at scoping meetings and by providing comments or recommendations regarding issues to be investigated in the EIR/EIS.

7.1.1.1 Notices of Preparation and Intent

NOP/NOI Requirements

As part of the scoping process, both State and federal lead agencies are required to prepare and distribute a notice informing interested parties that the lead agency will be preparing an EIR or EIS, respectively. CEQA requires State lead agencies to prepare a NOP, while NEPA similarly requires federal lead agencies to

prepare a NOI. The purpose of an NOP and NOI is to notify interested parties of the project or action and to solicit their participation in determining the scope of the EIR or EIS.

NEPA states that a federal lead agency must prepare and publish a NOI in the Federal Register “as soon as practicable” after its decision to prepare an environmental impact statement [40 CFR 1501.7]. Similar to CEQA for an NOP, NEPA also dictates the contents of a NOI when it states that a NOI must describe the proposed action and possible alternatives; describe the proposed scoping process, including any scoping meetings that may be held; and provide the name and address for a person at the lead agency that can answer questions related to the EIS [40 CFR 1508.22].

NOP/NOI for the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project EIR/EIS

Based upon the above State and federal requirements, an NOP and NOI were prepared and distributed for the proposed Project. The details of the Project’s NOP and NOI are described below.

The CPUC issued a NOP for the proposed Project on August 31, 2007. Consistent with CEQA (CEQA Guidelines §15082), the NOP summarized the proposed Project, stated the CPUC’s intention to prepare a joint EIR/EIS, and requested comments from interested parties. The NOP additionally described the EIR/EIS process and the proposed scope of the EIR/EIS; listed possible alternatives; identified public repository sites and other information sources (Project website, phone/fax hotline, and e-mail address) where Project information and documents were posted; and described the proposed Project’s scoping process and details of the scoping meetings.

The NOP was mailed via certified mail to federal, State, and local agencies. The NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2007 (SCH# 2007081156), which began a 39-day comment period. The review period for the NOP ended on October 8, 2007. Copies of the NOP were distributed to federal, State, regional, local agencies, Native American tribal representatives, elected officials, property owners, and other interested parties. Forty-nine (49) additional copies of the NOP were delivered to the local repository sites. A public scoping meeting notice, which contained information similar to that required by CEQA for the NOP, was mailed to over 15,000 individuals and agencies, and published in sixteen newspapers.

The Forest Service issued a NOI for the proposed Project, which was published in the *Federal Register* on September 7, 2007 (FR Vol. 72, No. 173, p. 51404). Consistent with NEPA (40 CFR 1508.22), the NOI included a description of the proposed action and possible alternatives, a description of the scoping process and scoping meetings, and identification of the official at the Forest Service who could answer Project-related questions.

The NOP and NOI are found in Appendix B of this EIR/EIS.

7.1.1.2 Scoping Meetings

Scoping Meeting Requirements

Generally, formal scoping meetings are optional under CEQA unless requested by the lead agency, responsible or trustee agencies, the State Clearinghouse, or the project applicant [CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15082(c)]. However, the State lead agency is required to conduct at least one scoping meeting if the project has been determined to be of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance, as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15206 [CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15082(c)(1)]. Further, CEQA encourages consultation with any organization or person believed to be interested in the project, but it is not required [CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15083].

As stated below, CEQA [CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15082(c)] states that notices of the scoping meeting must be sent to the county or cities where the proposed project would occur, responsible agencies, other

public agencies with jurisdiction over the project, and any organization or member of the public that submitted a written request for the notice.

“(1) For projects of statewide, regional or area wide significance pursuant to Section 15206, the lead agency shall conduct at least one scoping meeting. The lead agency shall provide notice of the scoping meeting to all of the following: (A) any county or city that borders on a county or city within which the project is located, unless otherwise designated annually by agreement between the lead agency and the county or city; (B) any responsible agency; (C) any public agency that has jurisdiction by law with respect to the project; (D) any organization or individual who has filed a written request for the notice.”

NEPA states that a federal lead agency may hold a scoping meeting whenever it deems it appropriate pursuant to 40 CFR 1501.7(b)(4), which states:

“As part of the scoping process the lead agency may: Hold an early scoping meeting or meetings which may be integrated with any other early planning meeting the agency has. Such a scoping meeting will often be appropriate when the impacts of a particular action are confined to specific sites.”

The required noticing for public hearings or public meetings for actions of local concern is similar to that described for the NOI in Section 7.1.1.1.

Scoping and Alternatives Meetings

As part of the public scoping process of the proposed Project, a total of nine public scoping meetings were held in seven locations to present information to the public on the Project and to take public comments on the scope and content of this EIR/EIS, as well as alternatives and mitigation measures to be considered.

Public scoping meeting notices were prepared for all the scoping meetings, which provided a brief description of the Project including a map, information on the meeting locations, and information on where to send comments, contact information, and the duration of the public comment period. The notices were mailed to over 15,000 parties including agencies, elected officials, area residents, and organizations that may have been interested in the proposed Project. The advertisements provided a brief synopsis of the Project and encouraged attendance at the meetings to share comments on the Project. The Notice of Public Meeting, including the date and location of the public meeting, was advertised in local and regional newspapers.

Additionally, a public meeting was held on January 17, 2008, in Brea, California, after the public comment period to discuss potential Alternatives to the Chino Hills Route Alternative (Alternative 4).

For the January 17 Alternatives meeting, 3,000 agencies, elected officials, area residents and organizations received notices regarding the time, date, and location of the meeting. The advertisements placed in local newspapers provided a brief synopsis of the proposed Project and four alternative routes in the Chino Hills area (Alternative 4), and encouraged attendance at the meeting to share comments on the proposed Project and alternatives.

The public scoping meetings listed in Table 7-1 were held to discuss what issues should be analyzed in this EIR/EIS.

Table 7-1. Public Scoping and Alternatives Meetings			
Date and Time	Location	No. of People Signed-in	Comment Letters Received @ Mtg.
Thursday September 6, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Whittier La Serna High School, Cafeteria 15301 Youngwood Drive, Whittier, CA 90605	16	2
Monday September 10, 2007 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Palmdale Palmdale Cultural Center 38350 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, CA 93550	11 15	1 1
Tuesday September 11, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Rosamond Kern County Library - Wanda Kirk Branch (Rosamond) 3611 Rosamond Blvd., Rosamond, CA 93561	11	0
Wednesday September 12, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Duarte Duarte Community Center 1600 Huntington Drive, Duarte, CA 91010	9	0
Thursday September 13, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Rosemead Garvey Community Center 9108 Garvey Avenue, Rosemead, CA 91770	7	1
Wednesday September 19, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Altadena Altadena Community Center 730 E. Altadena Drive, Altadena, CA 91001	13	0
Thursday September 20, 2007 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Chino Hills Chino Hills Council Chambers 2001 Grand Avenue, Chino Hills, CA 91709	53 272	3 166
Alternatives Meeting			
Date and Time	Location	No. of People Signed-in	Comment Letters Received @ Mtg.
Thursday January 17, 2008 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Brea Brea Community Center 695 E. Madison Way, Brea, CA 92821	193	5

In addition, the date and location of the public scoping meetings were posted on the Project website, and also advertised in local newspapers. The meeting advertisements for the public scoping meetings and Alternatives meetings were placed in the newspapers listed in Table 7-2 below.

Table 7-2. Newspaper Advertisements				
Publication	Type	Advertisement Dates (2007)		Areas Covered
Daily Publication Newspapers				
Los Angeles Daily News	Display	Tuesday, August 28	Sunday September 2	Lancaster, Palmdale, Santa Clarita
Los Angeles Times	Legal	Sunday, August 26	Thursday, August 30	General circulation
Antelope Valley Press	Display	Sunday, August 26	Thursday, August 30	Antelope Valley
The Signal Newspaper	Display	Sunday, August 26	Thursday, August 30	Santa Clarita
Whittier Daily News	Display	Sunday, August 26	Wednesday, August 29	Whittier and surrounding areas
La Opinion	Display	Wednesday, August 29	Sunday, September 2	General circulation
Chinese LA Daily News	Display	Wednesday, August 29	Sunday, September 2	Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties
The Korea Times	Display	Thursday, August 30	*	General Circulation
Pasadena Star News	Display	Thursday, August 30	Sunday, September 9	Pasadena, Rosemead, San Gabriel Valley
San Gabriel Valley Tribune	Display	Thursday, August 30	Sunday, September 9	San Gabriel Valley
Inland Valley Daily Bulletin	Display	Thursday, September 6	Sunday, September 16	Western San Bernardino County

Table 7-2. Newspaper Advertisements

Publication	Type	Advertisement Dates (2007)		Areas Covered
Weekly Publication Newspapers				
Agua Dulce/Acton Country Journal	Display	Saturday, September 1	Saturday, September 8	Acton/Agua Dulce
Champion Newspaper	Display	Saturday, September 8	Saturday, September 15	Chino Hills
Acton/Agua Dulce News	Display	Monday September 10**		Acton/Agua Dulce
Rosamond News	Display	Monday September 10**		Rosamond
Alternatives Meeting Newspaper Advertisements				
Publication	Type	Advertisement Dates (2008)	Areas Covered	
Daily Publication Newspapers				
Inland Valley Daily Bulletin	Display	Monday, January 7th	Western San Bernardino County and Chino Hills	
The Chinese Daily News	Display	Tuesday, January 8th	Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties	
Weekly Publication Newspapers				
Champion Newspaper	Display	Saturday, January 5th	Chino Hills, Chino, and South Ontario	
The Star Progress	Display	Thursday, January 10th	Brea and La Habra	

Notes: * The Korea Times does not publish on Sundays, however their subscribers receive a copy of the LA Times on Sundays.

** Although the publication dates for these papers is September 10, according to the publisher the newspapers were available in news stands on Friday, September 7.

The basic format of the meetings included a presentation of the proposed Project including background, project description, location using maps, and potential environmental impacts. After the presentation, the meeting attendees were allowed to present verbal comments or submit prepared written comments.

Handouts and informational materials available at the public meeting are listed below.

- Meeting Agenda
- Map of the Entire Project
- Maps of the Alternative Routes
- Project Fact Sheets
- Self-addressed Speaker Comment Sheet
- Speaker Registration Card

7.1.1.3 Scoping Report Summary

There are no CEQA or State requirements regarding the preparation of a scoping report. However, NEPA states that the federal lead agency may prepare a scoping report in order to document and publicize the comments, opinions, and issues that were made during the scoping process, but it is not required [Council on Environmental Quality Memorandum: Scoping Guidance, April 30, 1981, II(b)(6)]. The Scoping Guidance, April 30, 1981, II(b)(6) states:

“Several agencies have made a practice of sending out a post-scoping document to make public the decisions that have been made on what issues to cover in the EIS. This is not a requirement, but in certain controversial cases it can be worthwhile. Especially when scoping has been conducted by written comments, and there has been no face-to-face contact, a post-scoping document is the only assurance to the participants that they were heard and understood until the draft EIS comes out.”

Scoping Report and Alternatives Comment Summary Report

In November 2007 and February 2008, a comprehensive Scoping Report and Comment Summary Report were issued respectively. The reports summarize issues and concerns received from the public and various agencies during the scoping period and in January 2008 to discuss the Chino Hills Alternative with concerned area citizens.

The specific issues raised during the public scoping process are summarized below according to the following major themes:

- Human Environment Issues and Concerns
- Physical Environment Issues and Concerns
- Alternatives

Human Environmental Issues and Concerns

The majority of public comments focused on the potential effect of the Project on the human environment, most often expressing concerns with health risks arising from changes in electric and magnetic fields (EMF), visual and scenic impacts to private property, and the potential for noise and environmental justice impacts.

- **EMF-Related Health and Safety Issues.** The potential impacts of EMFs from the proposed Project were of concern to many. The comments on this issue ranged from wanting additional information on the extent of EMF exposure from the new lines to the type of long-term health consequences associated with the proposed Project. There was significant concern regarding the impact of EMF on children, especially in areas where children play close to the transmission line corridor. In addition, there was concern expressed about the potential of EMF to affect plant growth, pets, and wildlife. A number of commenters expressed concern that the Project would cause long-term health problems such as cancer.
- **Hazards.** Property owners expressed concern with construction impacts. Some property owners were concerned that the use of helicopters would cause towers to fall and damage property or injure residents and others were concerned with natural disasters causing towers to fall. Property owners were also concerned with the potential for the Project to impede firefighters from using helicopters or planes to fight fires.
- **Noise.** Noise was another significant concern. Property owners in the Chino Hills area expressed concern with the potential for 24-hour “humming” and “buzzing” from electrical lines. Residents stated that the noise from the proposed 500-kV lines would be significantly different from existing conditions and they thought the increased noise would be unacceptable in their neighborhoods. There was concern with how the noise associated with the Project would impact recreation areas and open space, as well as wildlife in preservation areas. Agencies and residents also expressed concern with the use of helicopters to construct the towers, and how the noise associated with aircraft would impact residents, recreationists, and wildlife.
- **Visual Resources.** The public has significant concerns regarding the impacts to visual quality resulting from the proposed Project, and its impact on private residences and public recreation areas. Residents from the City of Chino Hills stated that the Project would impact their quality of life because larger towers would be placed in a corridor that they believe is too small for 500-kV transmission lines and towers. Although Chino Hill’s residents were the most vocal about their concerns with the visual impacts of the Project, residents from La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar, and Ontario also expressed concerns with the size of the towers and general visual impact the Project would have in their communities.

There was also a significant amount of concern regarding the Project’s impact on public areas such as the Puente Hills, a planned project called River Commons, and county park facilities. For these projects, the concerns centered on the Project’s potential to significantly change the recreationist’s experience when hiking or visiting these recreation areas.

Physical Environmental Issues and Concerns

Public agencies and residents expressed concerns with the potential impacts that the Project may have on the physical environment, particularly to air quality, biological, cultural, geological, hazardous materials and hazardous wastes, hydrological and recreation resources, and traffic and transportation. In addition, some comments focused on the impacts to public service that would occur from the proposed Project.

- **Biological Resources.** The Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority (PHLNHPA) addressed the possible effects of the Project on wildlife movement and sensitive plant and animals in the Puente Hills. The PHLNHPA comments included mention of sensitive resources such as Coastal Sage Scrub habitat and the California Gnatcatcher. The Watershed Conservation Authority (WCA) commented on the potential impact to

habitat in the River Commons project. In particular, the WCA noted the Project's potential to interfere with wildlife movement.

- **Recreation Resources.** The Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority (PHLNHPA) has significant concerns with the Project's impact on recreationists. The Project's larger towers would change the character of public trails in the Puente Hills. Therefore, the environmental analysis should consider impacts from the perspective of recreationists. The WCA had concerns regarding the Project's impact on recreation areas planned for the River Commons project. They requested placement of the towers in areas where people would not typically gather so that the Project would not significantly affect the planned use for the Rivers Common site. Lastly, the County of Los Angeles had concern with how the Project would impact county parks and whether or not a park patron's experience would be compromised with the construction of the 500-kV towers.

Other Comments

During the initial scoping period, property owners also expressed concerns with the Project's impact on property values. The City of Chino Hills and numerous property owners expressed concern with the number of properties that would be affected by the Project. Residents of Chino Hills estimated approximately 1,000 homes would be impacted by the Project. According to these residents, if the property values substantially decreased for all of these homes as a result of the Project, then the Project's impact to the City would be significant. Even though the Project would occur in an existing ROW, the City has grown around the transmission ROW and some houses are now less than 150 feet away from the corridor. Also, residents expressed concern with the current width of the ROW and the increased height and capacity of the towers. This widespread concern, along with concerns regarding visual resources, EMF/health, and noise, in the City of Chino Hills encouraged the City to identify an alternative route, which is described below.

Alternatives

Many of the comments received focused on providing alternatives to the proposed Project. Specifically, alternatives suggested included the possibility of utilizing tubular steel poles instead of lattice towers, exploring other routes for the proposed transmission line and placing the line underground for portions of the proposed Project. Table 7-3 summarizes the alternatives suggested during the public scoping comment period.

Table 7-3. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping		
Commenter Category	Type ¹	Alternatives Description
Agency	R	Alternative that avoids impacts to the Habitat Authority Properties and avoids sensitive areas in the Puente Hills, including the No Project Alternative.
Agency	R	To reduce impacts to River Commons, the existing ROW could be moved, new ROWs could be acquired, or transmission lines could be sited along the I-605 corridor.
Agency Private Citizens	R	Place transmission lines underground in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the area north of Vincent up Peaceful Valley, if 500 kV is necessary between tower 20/2 to the bottom near Forest View at tower 19/3 [exact GPS coordinates are provided in the comment] River Commons area City of Irwindale.
Agency Private Citizens	R	The City of Chino Hills recommends full evaluation of an alternative that terminates Segment 8A into the existing Serrano-Mira Loma and Serrano-Rancho Vista 500 kV transmission lines, which currently run through Chino Hills State Park. Specifically, Segment 8A would initiate as proposed by SCE, two miles east of Mesa Substation in the Whittier Narrows. It would run along the SCE proposed route until it reaches the existing Walnut/Olinda-Mira Loma (220kV) and the existing unenergized Mesa-Chino transmission where they separate from one other. This separation is about 2 miles east of highway 57 in Los Angeles County. At that point, Segment 8A would veer southeast, paralleling (in the same corridor) the existing Walnut/Olinda-Mira Loma (220kV) line for about six miles until it nears the existing Serrano-Mira Loma and Serrano/Rancho Vista 500 kV lines. At that junction, Segment 8A would terminate into a switching station where the 500-kV lines would be looped. System

Table 7-3. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping		
Commenter Category	Type ¹	Alternatives Description
		studies performed by SCE (at the City's request) indicate that this alternative is acceptable and meets WECC and CAISO reliability criteria. To accommodate the second transmission line, this alternative would require acquisition of additional ROW in the Walnut/Olinda-Mira Loma corridor. This alternative requires a gas-insulated switching station to be built in the State Park.
Private Citizen	R	In Lancaster, an alternative location would be to go further west of the proposed route to approximately West 115th to 117th Streets. Another alternative would be to follow the existing route but build structures on the west side of the current power lines that extend between Ave I and Ave J at West 100th Street and West 105th Street.
Agency	R	Combine routes such as segments 6 and 7 into segment 11.
Agency	R	The City of Ontario requests that an alternative be considered for the 150-foot ROW expansion west of Haven Avenue, south of Chino Avenue. The location of the project in this area impacts proposed development and therefore the City of Ontario requests a reduction in the easement width from 150 to 100 feet to minimize potential impacts to development.
Private Citizen	R	Consider alternative that routes the transmission lines through the City of Industry, along existing ROWs. Instead of diverting the lines north of the landfill, run the lines through Industry and then rejoin them, which avoids going through the hills.
Private Citizen	R	Consider alternative that follows existing transportation and commercial ROW along the 60 freeway or railroad ROWs; route power lines behind the San Gabriel Mountains and come down the 15 Freeway.
Agency Organization	R NW S	Broaden the alternatives considered in the document such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ routing the line through industrial areas instead of residential areas, ▪ reducing new pole height to match existing pole height, ▪ use of wind or solar energy, ▪ use of a 230-kV alternative whenever and wherever possible ▪ use perimeter locations within cities (i.e., Irwindale).

¹ The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative), S (System Alternative) and NW (Non-Wire Alternative).

Alternatives Issues and Concerns

Pursuant to the comments above during the initial scoping period, an Alternatives Meeting was held on January 17, 2008, in Chino Hills, California, to discuss four alternatives as discussed in Section 2.4 of this EIR/EIS. Five written comments were provided at the January 2008 meeting, and 30 individuals, agencies, and organizations presented oral comments at the meeting. Eleven written comment letters were received by mail and fourteen written comments were received through the project email address. Table 7-3 provides a summary of the comments received during or after the Alternatives Meeting.

The comments at this meeting on the proposed project and four Alternative routes were as follows:

Human Environmental Issues and Concerns

- **Visual Resources.** The public has significant concerns regarding the impacts to visual quality resulting from the proposed Project, and its impact on private residences and public recreation areas. Residents from the City of Chino Hills stated that the Project would impact their quality of life because the transmission lines would negatively impact them due to the close proximity to their homes. Many comments were received about how the proposed transmission lines would detract from their experience at the Chino Hills State Park (CHSP).
- **Noise.** A few area residents were concerned about the humming created from operational transmission lines. One commenter was also concerned about how the noise from transmission lines would affect those wearing hearing aids.
- **EMF-Related Health and Safety Issues.** Many residents and citizens were concerned about the close proximity of the transmission lines to existing homes and the potential additional exposure to EMF from the proposed project. One commenter was concerned about how EMF from a 500 k-V line may create very strong radio and digital TV interference which may result in issues related to receiving information from public safety radio.
- **Hazards and Public Health and Safety.** Many commenters were concerned about the transmission lines and transformer increasing fire danger to the adjacent homes. Many citizens were concerned about towers

collapsing as well. Citizens expressed concern about the construction activities being hazardous to bikers, walkers and residents with children.

Physical Environmental Issues and Concerns

- **Biological Resources.** Many residents were concerned that the transmission lines would impact urban wildlife as well as wildlife that is potentially endangered and located in the CHSP.
- **Recreation.** Citizens, agencies and organizations encouraged the preservation of the CHSP as a protected open space.

Other Comments

- **CEQA/NEPA Process.** Two local businesses and a local and state agency requested more time to fully review and assess impacts of the proposed project.
- **Coordination with Agencies.** One agency commented that the proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment. Two businesses were concerned that DTSC had not been brought in to discuss remediation activities at the Aerojet site, which is adjacent to the proposed project.
- **Legal Considerations.** An organization strongly denounced the double-circuit transmission lines through the CHSP because of a previous settlement reached in which SCE agreed to construct only a single-circuit line through this area.
- **Property Values.** Many citizens and businesses were concerned about how the proposed transmission lines would affect property values in the area.

Alternatives

The public was very supportive of Alternative Route C and least supportive of Alternative Route D. Many commenters on the proposed project route requested that the consideration of the placement of the transmission line through CHSP be eliminated entirely. Many commenters were also in support of undergrounding the lines through the CHSP.

7.1.2 Notice of Completion and Availability

Per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15085, the Notice of Completion (NOC) is a document that must be filed with the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, as soon as the Draft EIR is completed. The NOC should include: a description of the proposed Project, including location; the address where copies of the Draft EIR are available for review; and the review period during which public comments may be received. The CEQA Lead Agency shall also provide public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR at the same time it sends the NOC to the State Clearinghouse (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087). In addition to the information disclosed in the NOC, the Notice of Availability (NOA) should also include details for any scheduled public meetings or hearings (date, time, and place); a list of significant environmental effects; and whether the project site is listed under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code (hazardous waste facilities). Lastly, the NOA should be posted at the county clerk for at least 30 days (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087[d]).

In compliance with NEPA (40 CFR 1506.6(b)(2)), a NOA of the Draft EIS must also be published in the *Federal Register*, thus beginning the public comment period. The NOA should be mailed to the USEPA, which is required to review all EISs; the USEPA is also responsible for publishing the NOA once it is received (40 CFR 1506.9, 1506.10).

Noticing Completed for the TRTP Draft EIR/EIS

The NOC was filed with the State Clearinghouse on February 13, 2009, along with 15 hard copies of the Draft EIR/EIS Executive Summary and a complete electronic version of the Draft EIR/EIS on CD. A NOA was prepared and distributed, which included a brief description of the Project, including a map, information on the meeting locations, information on where to send comments, contact information, and the duration of

the public comment period. The NOA was mailed to over 15,000 interested parties, including agencies, elected officials, area residents, and organizations. Additionally, the NOA was posted for a 30-day period with the Clerk's Office of the following counties: Los Angeles, Kern, San Bernardino, and Orange.

To address NEPA requirements, the USDA Forest Service published a notice regarding the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS in the *Federal Register* on February 20, 2009. The public review comment period was extended from April 1, 2009, to April 6, 2009, to account for the publication date in the *Federal Register*, which occurred after the State Clearinghouse filing date. A postcard notice was mailed to everyone on the Project notification list to announce this change in the public comment period.

Table 7-4 identifies the public advertisements of the NOA and public meetings that were placed in the local and regional newspapers. The advertisements provided a brief synopsis of the Project and encouraged attendance at the meetings to share comments on the Project. Two advertisement groupings were placed for the NOA and public meetings. A third advertisement grouping was placed only for notification of the public meetings.

Table 7-4. Draft EIR/EIS Newspaper Advertisements					
Publication	Type	NOA and Public Meeting Advertisement Dates		Public Meeting Advertisement Dates ¹	Areas Covered
Daily Publication Newspapers					
Los Angeles Daily News	Display	Friday, February 13	Friday, February 20	Wednesday, March 4	Lancaster, Palmdale, Santa Clarita
Los Angeles Times	Legal	Friday, February 13	Friday, February 20 ¹		General circulation
Antelope Valley Press	Display	Friday, February 13		Wednesday, March 4	Antelope Valley
The Signal Newspaper	Display	Friday, February 13		Thursday, March 5 ²	Santa Clarita
Whittier Daily News	Display	Friday, February 13	Friday, February 20	Wednesday, March 4	Whittier and surrounding areas
La Opinion	Display	Friday, February 13	Friday, February 20	Wednesday, March 4	General circulation
Chinese LA Daily News	Display	Tuesday, February 17	Tuesday, February 24	Wednesday, March 4	Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties
The Korea Times	Display	Saturday, February 14	Saturday, February 21	Wednesday, March 4	General Circulation
Pasadena Star News	Display	Friday, February 13		Wednesday, March 4	Pasadena, Rosemead, San Gabriel Valley
San Gabriel Valley Tribune	Display	Friday, February 13	Friday, February 20	Wednesday, March 4	San Gabriel Valley
Inland Valley Daily Bulletin	Display	Wednesday, February 18	Wednesday, February 25 ¹	Wednesday, March 4	Western San Bernardino County
Weekly Publication Newspapers					
Agua Dulce/Acton Country Journal	Display	Saturday, February 21 ¹		Saturday, March 7	Acton/Agua Dulce
Acton/Agua Dulce News	Display	Monday, February 16	Monday, February 23 ¹	Monday, March 9	Acton/Agua Dulce
Rosamond News	Display	Monday, February 16	Monday, February 23 ¹	Monday, March 9	Rosamond
Champion Newspaper	Display	Saturday, February 14	Saturday, February 21	Saturday, March 7	Chino Hills, Chino, and South Ontario
The Star Progress	Display	Thursday, February 19		Thursday, March 5	Brea and La Habra

1. Advertisement includes public review end-date extension to April 6, 2009.

2. Newspaper printed incorrect advertisement; advertisement did not include the April 6 end date.

7.1.3 Draft EIR/EIS Review and Public Hearings/Meetings

CEQA requires each lead agency to make efforts to involve the public in the environmental review process, particularly during review of the Draft EIR. CEQA states that the public review, or comment, period for a Draft EIR should be between 30 to 60 days, except when the Draft EIR has been submitted to the State Clearinghouse, in which case the review period is not less than and is normally 45 days (CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15087[e]; §15105[a]; §15205[d]).

NEPA requires the lead agency to circulate the Draft EIS to agencies and the public before or at the same time it is transmitted to the USEPA (40 CFR 1506.9). Public review of the Draft EIS should be at least 45 days (40 CFR 1506.10) and comments should be obtained from federal agencies with jurisdiction, and requested from appropriate State and local agencies, Native American tribes, agency requesting receipt of statements, the applicant, and the public (40 CFR 1503.1[a]; [b]).

Public Review Period and Public Meetings/Hearing for the TRTP Draft EIR/EIS

There was a 52-day public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS, which began on February 13, 2009, originally ended on April 1, 2009, and was extended to April 6, 2009.

Three public informational workshops, two public meetings, and one formal Public Participation Hearing were held during the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS. The public workshops provided an opportunity for members of the public to learn about the Project and ask questions. EIR/EIS section authors were available at the workshops to respond to any questions presented by the workshop attendees. The workshops included Project-related handouts and reference materials (e.g., EIR/EIS, Map and Figure Series Volume), maps that showed the proposed and alternative routes, and continuous-loop PowerPoint presentations that provided information on the Project description, review process, and key issues of public concern and how these issues were addressed in the EIR/EIS. In addition, the workshops included the use of computers to show property owners the location of their property in relation to the proposed Project route, and large-scale visual simulations (on a separate large computer screen) to show how the proposed Project transmission structures and other Project components would look from different public viewing areas. Immediately after each of the three workshops, the CPUC and Forest Service held either a public meeting or a hearing to take public comment on the Project. A court reporter recorded all oral comments presented at the public meetings and at the Public Participation Hearing. The CPUC held a Public Participation Hearing in Chino Hills, which was facilitated by the Administrative Law Judge and included one CPUC Commissioner and representatives for the other commissioners. In addition to the public meetings/hearing, there were other publicly advertised avenues to provide public comment on the Draft EIR/EIS. Comments were accepted by mail, email, or phone/fax. All Project-related notices, newspaper advertisements, and workshop/meeting handouts included information on where and how comments could be provided to the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service.

Table 7-5 lists the locations and dates of the public workshops, public meetings, and Public Participation Hearing held for the Project during the Draft EIR/EIS public review period.

Table 7-5. Informal Workshops, Public Meetings, and Public Participation Hearing

Advertised Date and Time	Type	Location	No. of People Signed-in	Comment Letters Received @ Mtg.
Wednesday March 18, 2009 5:00 pm to 6:30 pm	Public Workshop	Palmdale Hilton Garden Inn 1309 Rancho Vista Boulevard Palmdale, CA 93551	N/A ¹	N/A
Wednesday March 18, 2009 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Public Meeting	Palmdale Hilton Garden Inn 1309 Rancho Vista Boulevard Palmdale, CA 93551	32	1
Thursday March 19, 2009 5:00 pm to 6:30 pm	Public Workshop	Chino Hills Chino Hills Library Community Room 14000 City Center Drive Chino Hills, CA 91709	N/A	N/A
Thursday March 19, 2009 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Public Participation Hearing	Chino Hills City of Chino Hills, Council Chambers 14000 City Center Drive Chino Hills, CA 91709	Over 260 ² (estimate)	25
Tuesday March 24, 2009 5:00 pm to 6:30 pm	Public Workshop	Pasadena Pasadena High School, Cafeteria 2925 East Sierra Madre Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91107	N/A	N/A
Tuesday March 24, 2009 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	Public Meeting	Pasadena Pasadena High School, Cafeteria 2925 East Sierra Madre Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91107	25	0

1. Workshop participants were not required to sign in. Attendees of the public meetings were asked to sign-in or register before entering the meeting.
2. The number of people that signed in at the hearing is based on information provided by CPUC Public Affairs Office and is an estimate. There was no sign-in required of hearing attendees. However, individuals that wanted to present oral comments were required to sign in with the CPUC Public Affairs Officer. Fifty (50) speakers, including 11 elected officials, signed in and presented oral comments at the hearing.

7.1.4 Noticing for General Conformity

Per the Environmental Protection Agency (40 CFR §93.155, Reporting Requirements), a Federal agency making a conformity determination must provide to the appropriate EPA Regional Office, State and local air quality agencies and, where applicable, affected Federal land managers, a 30-day notice which describes the proposed action and the Federal agency's draft conformity determination on the action. The Forest Service, as the Federal lead agency for the TRTP, has provided as part of this Final EIR/EIS the draft conformity determination in Appendix C.2 (General Conformity Analysis).

Per 40 CFR §93.156 (Public Participation), "A Federal agency must make public its draft conformity determination under §93.158 by placing a notice by prominent advertisement in a daily newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the action and by providing 30 days for written public comment prior to taking any formal action on the draft determination." As part of the distribution of this Final EIR/EIS to the agencies who commented on the Draft EIR/EIS, an advertisement in the legal section of the Los Angeles Times will also be placed describing the availability of the general conformity analysis for a 30-day public review period at the repository sites described in Section 7.1.5, below. Written public comments specific to the draft general conformity determination will be accepted during the 30-day public review period. Responses to these comments will be made available upon request within 30 days of the final conformity determination (40 CFR §93.156[c]).

Similar to the noticing requirements for the draft general conformity determination, 40 CFR §93.156(d) states that a “Federal agency must make public its final conformity determination under §93.158 for a Federal action by placing a notice by prominent advertisement in a daily newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the action within 30 days of the final conformity determination.” Therefore, within 30 days following the certification of the Record of Decision (ROD) by the Forest Service, where the final conformity determination will be completed and approved, an advertisement within the legal section of the Los Angeles Times will be placed announcing the final conformity determination.

7.1.5 Document Repository Sites

Document Repository Site Requirements

Both CEQA [CCR §15087(c)(5) and §15087(g)] and NEPA [40 CFR 1506.6(f)] require lead agencies to make project documents available to the public for review. Placing documents in repository sites is an effective way of providing ongoing information about the project to a large number of people. The CEQA/NEPA documents prepared as part of the proposed Project, which include the NOP, NOI, NOA, Draft EIR/EIS, and other notices including the notice of public meetings and notice of extension of the public review period have been made available at the following public repository sites listed in Table 7-6.

Table 7-6. Public Repository Sites	
Repository Sites	Address
USDA Forest Service, Angeles National Forest	
ANF Supervisor's Office	701 N. Santa Anita Ave., Arcadia, CA 91006 626-574-5200
Santa Clara/Mojave Rivers Ranger District	28245 Avenue Crocker, Suite 220, Valencia, CA 91355 661-296-9710
Los Angeles River Ranger District	12371 N. Little Tujunga Canyon Road, San Fernando, CA 91342 818-899-1900
San Gabriel River Ranger District	110 N. Wabash Avenue, Glendora, CA 91741 626-335-1251
Public Libraries	
Arcadia Library	20 West Duarte Rd., Arcadia, CA 91006 626-821-5567
Azusa City Library	729 N. Dalton Ave., Azusa, CA 91702 626-812-5232
Baldwin Park Library	4181 Baldwin Park Blvd., Baldwin Park, CA 91706 626-962-6947
Diamond Bar Library	1061 S. Grand Ave. Diamond Bar, CA 91765 909-861-4978
Duarte Public Library	1301 Buena Vista St., Duarte, CA 91010 626-358-1865
El Monte Library	3224 Tyler Ave., El Monte, CA 91731 626-444-9506
Irwindale Public Library	5050 N. Irwindale Ave., Irwindale, CA 91706 626-430-2229
La Cañada Flintridge Library	4545 N. Oakwood Ave., La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011 818-790-3330
Lancaster Public Library	601 W. Lancaster Blvd., Lancaster, CA 93534 661-948-5029
Monrovia Public Library	843 E. Olive Ave., Monrovia, CA 91016 626-256-8274
Montebello Library	1550 W. Beverly Blvd., Montebello, CA 90640 323-722-6551

Table 7-6. Public Repository Sites	
Repository Sites	Address
Monterey Park Bruggemeyer Library	318 S. Ramona Ave., Monterey Park, CA 91754 626-307-1368
Ontario Main Library	215 East "C" St., Ontario, CA 91764 909-395-2004
Palmdale City Library	700 E. Palmdale Blvd., Palmdale, CA 93550 616-267-5600
Pasadena Central Library	285 E. Walnut St., Pasadena, CA 91101 626-744-4066
Pico Rivera Library	9001 Mines Ave., Pico Rivera, CA 90660 562-942-7394
Rosemead Library	8800 Valley Blvd., Rosemead, CA 91770 626-573-5220
San Gabriel Public Library	500 S. Del Mar Ave., San Gabriel, CA 91776 626-287-0761
San Marino (Crowell) Public Library	1890 Huntington Dr., San Marino, CA 91108 626-300-0777
South El Monte Library	1430 N. Central Ave. South El Monte, CA 91733 626-443-4158
Temple City Library	5939 Golden West Ave., Temple City, CA 91780 626-285-2136
Whittier Central Library	7344 S. Washington Ave., Whittier, CA 90602 562-464-3450
SCE Service Centers	
Antelope Service Center	42060 10 th St. West, Lancaster, CA 93534 661-726-5608
Tehachapi Service Center	421 W. "J" St. Tehachapi, CA 93561 661-726-5608
Whittier Service Center	9901 Geary Ave., Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 562-903-3106
Monrovia Service Center	1440 S. California Ave., Monrovia, CA 91016 626-303-8429
Covina Service Center	800 W. Cienega Ave. San Dimas, CA 91773 909-592-3758
Ontario Service Center	1351 E. Francis Street, Ontario, CA 91761 909-930-8501
Montebello Service Center	1000 E. Potrero Grande Dr. Monterey Park, 91755 323-720-5213
Redlands Service Center	287 Tennessee Street, Redlands, CA 92373 909-307-6726
Agency Office	
Chino Hills City Clerk's Office ¹	14000 City Center Drive, Chino Hills, CA 91709 909-364-2600

1. The City Clerk's Office replaced the James S. Thalman Chino Hills Branch Library as a repository site during the Draft EIR/EIS public review period. The library was moved to the new Chino Hills Civic Center and was closed from February 13 through February 27, 2009.

In order to offer another opportunity to inquire about the public scoping meetings, Draft EIR/EIS public meetings/workshops, Public Participation Hearing, or the proposed Project, a telephone hotline ([888] 331-9897) was established to provide periodic public messages and enable the public to leave recorded messages. Verbal comments on the EIR/EIS are not accepted on the hotline, but the hotline number does allow for comments to be submitted in writing by fax.

An e-mail address has been established for the Project (TRTP@aspeneg.com) to provide another means of submitting comments on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS. The e-mail address was provided on scoping meeting handouts, Draft EIR/EIS meeting/workshop handouts, and is posted on the website.

Ongoing information about the proposed Project was made available through the Project website hosted by the CPUC. During the scoping and Draft EIR/EIS period, the website included electronic versions of the Project application, NOP, NOI, NOA, Draft EIR/EIS, and Project-related maps, providing another public venue to learn about the Project. The website will remain a public information resource for the Project and will announce future public meetings and hearings. The website address is:

ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/gopher-data/enviro/tehachapi_renewables/TRTP.htm

7.1.7 Project Notification List and Document Distribution List

Aspen compiled a comprehensive mailing list for the TRTP. The scoping mailing list included approximately 15,000 entries. Aspen used the mailing list to distribute the NOP, NOA, and the postcard notices. Aspen will continue to use the list throughout the life of the environmental review process for the Project to distribute public notices at key milestones. It has been updated to incorporate those individuals that attended the public scoping meetings, Draft EIR/EIS public meetings, and submitted written comments on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS. The mailing list includes the following components:

- Elected officials
- Federal, State, and local agency representatives
- Regional and Joint Power Authorities
- Angeles National Forest Scoping List (June 7, 2007)
- CPUC Service List (February 2009)
- Property owner list from SCE's PEA (within 300 feet of the proposed Project route)
- Property owners within 301 to 500 feet of the proposed route
- Within the Angeles National Forest, property owners within 2.5 miles of the route
- Wind developers
- Tribal government representatives
- Potentially interested community organizations and interest groups
- Local libraries/document repository site

7.2 Organizations and Persons Consulted

State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15129) states that an "EIR shall identify all federal, state, or local agencies, other organizations, and private individuals consulted in preparing the draft EIR." Table 7-7 provides a listing of those persons consulted as part of the preparation of this EIR/EIS. In addition to the contacts noted on Table 7-7, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, California Native Plant Society, Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden, California Native American Heritage Commission, and the San Bernardino, South Central Coastal, and Southern San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Centers were consulted regarding project site resources.

Table 7-7. Organizations and Persons Consulted		
Name	Title	Organization/Agency
Agricultural Resources		
James Nordstrom	Research Analyst 2 – GIS	California Department of Conservation
Jacqui Farnholtz	Planner 2	Kern County Planning Department
Biological Resources		
Doug Johnson	Executive Director	Cal-IPC (California Invasive Plant Council)
David Moskovitz	-	Puente Hills Landfill Habitat Preservation Authority

Table 7-7. Organizations and Persons Consulted		
Name	Title	Organization/Agency
Janet Nickerman	Biologist	USDA Forest Service
Nancy Sandburg	Biologist	USDA Forest Service
Katie VinZant	Biologist	USDA Forest Service
Nathan Sill	Biologist	USDA Forest Service
Patricia Krueger	Regional Threatened and Endangered Species Coordinator	USDA Forest Service
Jesse Grantham	Biologist	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Richard Posey	Biologist	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Joseph DiTomaso	Biologist	University of California at Davis
Joe Burnett	Biologist	Ventana Wildlife Society
Cultural Resources		
Darrel Vance	Forest Archaeologist	Angeles National Forest
Larynn Carver	District Archaeologist	California Department of Parks and Recreation, Chino Hills State Park
Land Use		
Lorena Mejia	Assistant Planner	City of Ontario Planning Department
Lorelei Oviatt	Division Chief	Kern County Planning Department
Eileen Schoetzow	-	Los Angeles World Airports, Regional Airports Planning Div.
Jim Squire	-	San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department
Noise		
Joe Martinez	Code Enforcement Supervisor	City of South El Monte
Public Services and Utilities		
Greg Turner	Fire Chief	Chino Valley Independent Fire District
John Knowles	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Altadena – Station 11
Rick Jimenez	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Altadena – Station 12
David Middleton	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Azusa – Station 32
Gerald Gonzalez	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Baldwin Park – Station 29
Dan Gordon	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Baldwin Park – Station 29
Eric McKeller	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Baldwin Park – Station 97
Tom Jones	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Duarte – Station 44
Robert Brandelli	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 130
Larry Sotelo	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 166
Brian Underwood	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 168
Steve Bibbaum	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 169
Ernie Gregoire	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Hacienda Heights – Station 91
Paul Sotelo	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Industry – Station 87
Captain Sanchez	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Industry – Station 118
David Molner	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Irwindale – Station 48
Don Holzer	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, La Cañada Flintridge – Station 19
Michael McCormack	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, La Cañada Flintridge – Station 82
Chad Boozer	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, La Puente – Station 12
Carlos Estrella	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, La Puente – Station 43
Dana Rickman	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Lake Hughes – Station 78
Joe Grayston	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Pasadena – Station 66
Anthony Jefferson	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Pico Rivera – Station 25
Joe Khodavandi	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Pico Rivera – Station 40
Ryan Millan	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Pico Rivera – Station 103
Mike Jaspersen	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Quartz Hill – Station 84
James Roy	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Rosemead – Station 42
Al Traxler	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, San Gabriel – Station 5
Guy Favatella	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, South El Monte – Station 90

Table 7-7. Organizations and Persons Consulted

Name	Title	Organization/Agency
Scott Hagin	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 4
Chuck Flack	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 17
Rick Fullerton	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 28
Scott Oglebie	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 59
Bryan Kidder	Fire Chief	Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 96
Dave Dennis	Fire Chief	Monrovia Fire Department
Mark Hail	Fire Chief	Monterey Park Fire Department
Danny Serna	Fire Chief	Pasadena Fire Department
Wilderness and Recreation		
Howard Okamoto	Recreation Officer	Angeles National Forest, Los Angeles River Ranger District
Justin Seastrand	Special Uses Coordinator	Angeles National Forest
Patrick Reynolds	Landscape Architect	Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation
Chuck Williams	Transmission Engineer	R.W. Beck
Jane Beesley	Director of Special Projects and Interpretation	San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy
Visual Resources		
Sonja Bergdahl	Forest Engineer	Angeles National Forest
George Farra	Forest Service Engineer	Angeles National Forest
Jose Henriquez-Santos	Landscape Architect	Angeles National Forest
Elizabeth Cutler	Visual Resource Project Manager	CH2M Hill, Inc.
Thomas Priestley	Senior Visual Resource Specialist	CH2M Hill, Inc.
Enrique Arroyo	Associate Park and Recreation Specialist	California State Parks
David Crabtree	City Planner	City of Brea
John Mura	Assistant to the City Manager	City of Chino Hills
Johnnie Davis	Engineering Technician	
Ken Kietzer	Environmental Scientist	Chino Hills State Park
John Roe	Park Superintendant	Chino Hills State Park
Dennis Stephen	State Park Ranger	Chino Hills State Park
Gil Calderon	Assistant Center Manager	Clear Creek Outdoor Recreation Center, Los Angeles Unified School District
Mark Gardina	Center Manager	
Chuck Williams	Transmission Engineer	R.W. Beck
Tracy Alsobrook	Environmental Project Manager	Southern California Edison
Brent Gokbudak	Professional Engineer – Corporate Environment, Health and Safety	Southern California Edison
Susan J. Nelson	Regulatory Affairs Manager	Southern California Edison
Trinidad Juarez	Landscape Architect/Recreation Planner	US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Pacific Southwest Regional Office
Development of the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area		
Michael Hollier,	Planner 2	Kern County
Lorelai Oviatt	Division Chief	Kern County
Brian S. Marshall,	Deputy Chief	Kern County Fire Department
Richard Wood,	Sergeant	Kern County Sheriff's Office
Paula Dickerson	Administrative Assistant to Superintendent	Mojave Unified School District
Dr. Richard Swanson	Superintendent	Tehachapi Unified School District
Jessie Grantham	Biologist	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

7.3 Preparers and Contributors

Table 7-8 provides a listing of those persons from the Lead Agencies, including both the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service, who were involved in the review of this EIR/EIS.

Table 7-8. Lead Agency Project Team		
Name	Agency	Title
Thomas Flynn	California Public Utilities Commission	CPUC Project Manager (prior to June 2009)
John Boccio	California Public Utilities Commission	CEQA Co-Project Manager
Junaid Rahman	California Public Utilities Commission	CEQA Co-Project Manager
Laurence Chaset	California Public Utilities Commission	Legal Counsel
Jody Noiron	USDA Forest Service	ANF Forest Supervisor
Marty Dumpis	USDA Forest Service	ANF Deputy Forest Supervisor
Denise Hann	USDA Forest Service	NEPA Coordinator
Justin Seastrand	USDA Forest Service	Special Uses Coordinator
Kathy Peterson	USDA Forest Service	ANF Acting NEPA Coordinator
Sonja Bergdahl	USDA Forest Service	ANF Forest Engineer
George Farra	USDA Forest Service	ANF Assistant Forest Engineer
Dave Conklin	USDA Forest Service	ANF Forest Fire Management Officer
Joe Gonzalez	USDA Forest Service	ANF Physical Science Technician (Hazardous Materials)
Paul Gregory	USDA Forest Service	ANF Forest Hydrology
Jose Henriquez-Santos	USDA Forest Service	ANF Landscape Architect
John Capell	USDA Forest Service	SCMRRD District Ranger
Mike McIntyre	USDA Forest Service	LARRD District Ranger
Mike McCorison	USDA Forest Service	Zone Air Resource Specialist
Nancy Sandburg	USDA Forest Service	ANF Forest Biologist
Patricia Krueger	USDA Forest Service	Regional Threatened and Endangered Species Coordinator
Janet Nickerman	USDA Forest Service	ANF Botanist
Leslie Welch	USDA Forest Service	ANF Wildlife Biologist
Katherine VinZant	USDA Forest Service	ANF Botanist
Nathan Sill	USDA Forest Service	ANF Wildlife Biologist
Howard Okamoto	USDA Forest Service	LARRD Recreation Officer
Bruce Quintelier	USDA Forest Service	SGRRD Recreation Officer
Mike Roberts	USDA Forest Service	ANF Roads
Darrell Vance	USDA Forest Service	ANF Forest Archaeologist
Sherry Rollman	USDA Forest Service	ANF Forest Public Affairs Officer
Diane Torpin	USDA Forest Service	ANF Fuels Specialist
Nathan Sill	USDA Forest Service	ANF Wildlife Biologist
Patricia Krueger	USDA Forest Service	ANF Wildlife Biologist
Tom Kaucher	USDA Forest Service	ANF Motorized Recreation Specialist
L'Tanga Watson	USDA Forest Service	SGRRD District Ranger
April Harges	USDA Forest Service	ANF Landscape Architect STEP

In accordance with CEQA and NEPA (State CEQA Guidelines §15063(d)(6) and 40 CFR 1502.17, Forty Questions No. 27), Table 7-9 provides a list of the persons that prepared, or participated in the preparation of, this EIR/EIS. Also included in Table 7-9 are the qualifications (professional certifications, education, area of expertise, and years of experience) of the individual members of the EIR/EIS team.

Table 7-9. EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers		
Name	Degree/Expertise (Years of Experience)	Role
EIR/EIS Prime Contractor		
<i>Aspen Environmental Group (Primary Consultant)</i>		
Jon Davidson, AICP	American Institute of Certified Planners; Master of Urban and Regional Planning; BA Urban Planning (27 years)	Project Manager
Negar Vahidi	Master of Public Administration; BA Political Science (16 years)	Deputy Project Manager
Lisa Blewitt	BS Chemical Engineering (12 years)	Deputy Project Manager, Project Description and Alternatives Issue Area Coordinator
Sandra Alarcón-Lopez	MA Architecture and Urban Planning; BA Speech and Hearing Sciences (25 years)	Public Involvement Manager
Chris Huntley	MS Biology; BA Biology (17 years)	Biological Resources Issue Area Coordinator; Development of the TWRA: Biological Resources
Jason Ricks	MS Public Health; BS Biology (13 years)	Physical Sciences, Earth & Water Resources Issue Area Coordinator; Traffic and Transportation
Vida Strong	Master of Urban Planning; BS Electronics Engineering (22 years)	Development of the TWRA Issue Area Coordinator
Sue Walker	MA Applied Geography; BA Physical Geography (19 years)	Social Sciences Issue Area Coordinator; Land Use
Shruti Chandra	BA Environmental Studies (10 years)	Development of the TWRA: Geology and Soils, Introduction, Land Use and Planning
Scott Debauche	BS Urban & Regional Planning (13 years)	Noise; Environmental Justice
George Hampton	BA Geography; Expert in NEPA Compliance (35 years)	Development of the TWRA: Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Utilities, Wind Development in the TWRA
Jacob Hawkins	Master of Environmental Science and Management; BS Biology (9 years)	Agricultural Resources
Susanne Huerta	Master of Urban Planning; BA Geography (2 years)	Public Services and Utilities; Development of the TWRA: Mineral Resources
Jamison Miner	BS Biology (5 years)	Biological Resources; Development of the TWRA: Biological Resources
Jennifer Lancaster	MS Biology; BS Biology (7 years)	Biological Resources; Development of the TWRA: Biological Resources
Matthew Long	MPP Environmental and Natural Resource Management; BA Comparative Literature (3 years)	Hydrology and Water Quality; Development of the TWRA: Noise, Wilderness and Recreation
Aubrey Mescher	Master of Environmental Science and Management; B.A., Environmental Studies and Film Theory (5 years)	Socioeconomics; Wilderness and Recreation; Development of the TWRA: Hydrology and Water Quality
Marissa Mitchell	MA Environmental Studies; BS Environmental Sciences (3 years)	Fire Prevention and Suppression
Will Walters, PE	PE Chemical Engineering; BS Chemical Engineering; AQ Specialist (22 years)	Air Quality
Stanley Yeh	MPA Environmental Policy; BS Environmental Studies (10 years)	Development of the TWRA: Introduction, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Population and Housing, Public Services, Traffic and Transportation, Wind Development in the TWRA
Craig Hattori	BA Philosophy; Graphics (17 years)	Computer Graphics; Technical Mapping
Anton Kozhevnikov	BS Geography (10 years)	Geographic Information Systems
Kati Simpson	BA Geography; Graphics (23 years)	Computer Graphics
Judy Spicer	BA English (43 years)	Contracting; Document Production
EIR/EIS Subcontractors		
<i>Applied Earthworks, Inc.</i>		
Barry Price	MA Cultural Resource Management; BA Anthropology (33 years)	Cultural Resources

Table 7-9. EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers

Name	Degree/Expertise (Years of Experience)	Role
Robert Lichtenstein	MA Archaeological Studies; BS Physics (15 years)	Cultural Resources
Sarah Wallace	BA Anthropology (9 years)	Cultural Resources
David Price	BA Anthropology (3 years)	Cultural Resources
Marc Linder	BA Physical Anthropology (19 years)	Cultural Resources
Jim Redmoon	AA Anthropology (17 years)	Cultural Resources
David Largo	(16 years)	Cultural Resources
Robin Mitchell	BA Anthropology (3 years)	Cultural Resources
Arellano Associates		
Chester Britt	BA Business Administration (19 years)	Public Involvement
Maria Yanez-Forgash	Master of Public Administration; BA Criminal Justice (10 years)	Public Involvement
Elsa Argomaniz	AA Business Administration (22 years)	Public Involvement
Christopher A. Joseph & Associates		
Shannon Lucas	BS Biology (11 years)	Botany
Amy Parravano	BS Ecology and Systematic Biology (13 years)	Botany
Emma Jack	PhD Plant Ecotoxicology & Ecology (13 years)	Botany
Chad Flynn	BS Aquatic Biology and GIS Certification Program (5 years)	Geographic Information Systems
<i>GeoGraphics, Inc.</i>		
Gerald Hughes	BA Geography; Cartographic and GIS (25 years)	Geographic Information Systems
Anna Schemper	BS Environmental Science/Biology (3 years)	Geographic Information Systems
Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.		
Aurie Patterson	MS Geology; BA Geology (15 years)	Geology, Soils, and Paleontology
James Thurber	MS Geology; BS Geology; BA Geography (26 years)	Groundwater and Contamination
H.T. Harvey & Associates		
Brian Boroski	PhD Wildland Resource Science; MS Natural Resources; BS Biology (21 years)	Biological Resources
Patrick Boursier	PhD Plant Physiology; MS Agronomy and Range Science; BS Biological Sciences (28 years)	Biological Resources
Amanda Breen	PhD Plant Biology; BS Botany; BS Biology (7 years)	Biological Resources
Howard Clark	MS Biology; BS Biological Sciences (11 years)	Biological Resources
Jeff Davis	BS Wildlife and Fisheries Biology (22 years)	Biological Resources
Daniel Duke	JD Environmental Law; BA Communications (7 years)	Biological Resources
Kelly Hardwicke	PhD Ecology; BA Biology (10 years)	Biological Resources
Edward Kentner	PhD Genetics; MA Biology; BS Botany (13 years)	Biological Resources
Sharon Kramer	PhD Marine Biology, MS Zoology, BA Aquatic Biology (25 years)	Biological Resources
Marc Meyer	PhD Ecology; MS Biology; BA Environmental Biology (10 years)	Biological Resources
Darren Newman	BA Biology (11 years)	Biological Resources
Matt Quinn	MS Ecology & Hydrology, BA Geography (11 years)	Biological Resources
Jeff Seay	BA Biology (22 years)	Biological Resources
Onkar Singh	BS Biology (3 years)	Biological Resources
Randy Sisk	MS Biology; BS Biology (18 years)	Biological Resources
Dan Stephens	BS Natural Resources (29 years)	Biological Resources
Hunt & Associates Biological Consulting Services		
Lawrence Hunt	PhD Candidate Evolutionary Ecology (Herpetology); MS Ecology and Systematics (Herpetology); BS Vertebrate Zoology (Herpetology) (30 years)	Biological Resources
Lee Roger Anderson		
Lee Anderson	Master of Landscape Architecture; BS Landscape Architecture (39 years)	Visual Resources
Timothy Zack	Bachelor's Degree of Architecture (16 years)	Design Visualization
R.W. Beck		

Table 7-9. EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers		
Name	Degree/Expertise (Years of Experience)	Role
Chuck Williams, PE	PE Civil Engineering; BS Civil Engineering (25 years)	EMFs; Transmission Engineering
Scheuerman Consulting		
Paul Scheuerman, PE	PE Electrical Engineering; BS Electrical Engineering (35 years)	Transmission Planning
Scott White Biological Consulting		
Scott White	MA Biology; BA Biology (21 years)	Biological Resources
Justin Wood	BS Biology (8 years)	Biological Resources

7.4 Document Distribution List

Notices regarding the availability of environmental documents, such as the NOP, NOI, NOA, and Draft EIR/EIS, were mailed to approximately 15,400 addresses, including regulatory agencies, tribal governments, community organizations, interest groups, and property owners in the vicinity of the proposed Project and alternative routes. Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were distributed to the following agencies and organizations:

Federal Agencies

- Edwards Air Force Base
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- US Environmental Protection Agency

State Agencies

- Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game
- Calif. Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- Calif. Dept. of Toxic Substances Control
- Calif. Dept. of Water Resources
- Calif. Public Utilities Commission
- Calif. State Park and Recreation Commission
- Calif. Energy Commission
- Caltrans District 7
- Caltrans District 8
- Caltrans District 9
- Native American Heritage Commission
- State Office of Historic Preservation

County/Regional Agencies

- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AQMD)
- County of Kern, Planning Dept.
- County of San Bernardino, Land Use Services Dept.
- Kern County Air Pollution Control District
- LA County Dept. of Environmental Health

- LA County Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- LA County Dept. of Public Works
- LA County Dept. of Regional Planning
- LA Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- Lahontan RWQCB
- Puente Hills Landfill/Native Habitat Preservation Authority
- San Gabriel and Lower LA Rivers and Mts. Conservancy
- Santa Ana RWQCB
- South Coast AQMD

Local Agencies

- City of Arcadia
- City of Azusa
- City of Baldwin Park
- City of Brea
- City of Chino
- City of Chino Hills
- City of Diamond Bar
- City of Duarte
- City of El Monte
- City of Industry
- City of Irwindale
- City of La Cañada Flintridge
- City of La Habra Heights
- City of Lancaster
- City of Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power

- City of Monrovia
- City of Montebello
- City of Monterey Park
- City of Ontario
- City of Palmdale
- City of Pasadena
- City of Pico Rivera
- City of Rosemead
- City of San Gabriel
- City of San Marino
- City of South El Monte
- City of Temple City
- City of Whittier
- Pico Rivera Public Library
- Rosemead Public Library
- San Gabriel Public Library
- San Marino Public Library
- South El Monte Public Library
- Temple City Public Library
- Whittier Central Library

Organizations/Interested Parties

- Acton Town Council
- Aerojet – General Corporation
- Goodin, MacBride, Squeri, Day & Lamprey, LLP
- Law Office of J. William Yeates
- Leona Valley Town Council
- William F. Dietrich, Attorney at Law

Public Repositories

USDA, Forest Service, Angeles National Forest (ANF)

- ANF Supervisor's Office
- Santa Clara/Mojave Rivers Ranger Station
- Los Angeles River Ranger District
- San Gabriel River Ranger District

Public Libraries

- Arcadia Public Library
- Azusa Public Library
- Baldwin Park Public Library
- Diamond Bar Public Library
- Duarte Public Library
- El Monte Public Library
- Irwindale Public Library
- James S. Thalman Chino Hills Branch Library
- La Cañada Flintridge Public Library
- Lancaster Regional Public Library
- Monrovia Public Library
- Montebello Public Library
- Monterey Park Bruggemeyer Library
- Ontario Main Library
- Palmdale Public Library
- Pasadena Central Library

Southern California Edison (SCE)

- SCE Antelope Service Center
- SCE Covina Service Center
- SCE Monrovia Service Center
- SCE Montebello Service Center
- SCE Ontario Service Center
- SCE Redlands Service Center
- SCE Tehachapi Service Center
- SCE Whittier Service Center